

SHORT COMMUNICATION

Leadership Styles of BSRI and BSFIC Professionals

S. K. Pal and M.A. Mannan

Bangladesh Sugarcane Research Institute,
Ishurdi-6620, Pabna, Bangladesh.

Key words : Leadership style, leadership grid, components of leadership.

Leadership is a process by which a person influences others to accomplish an objective and directs the organization in a way that makes it more cohesive and coherent. Leaders carry out this process by applying their leadership attributes, such as beliefs, values, ethics, character, knowledge, and skills. Position of manager, supervisor, etc. gives the authority to accomplish certain tasks and objectives in the organization, but this power does not make a leader, it simply makes the boss. Leadership differs in that it makes the followers want to achieve high goals, rather than simply bossing people around (Bass 1989).

The basis of good leadership is an important character and selfless service to organization. In employees' eyes, leadership is everything that effects the organization's objectives and their well-being. Respected leaders concentrate on what they are (such as beliefs and character), what they know (such as job, tasks, and human nature), and what they *do* (such as implementing, motivating, and providing direction) (Bass 1990). There are 75 key components of employee satisfaction. Trust and confidence in top leadership was the single most reliable predictor of employee (Lamb and McKee, 2004).

Leadership models help us to understand what makes leaders act the way they do. The ideal is not to lock in to a type of behavior, but to realize that every situation calls for a different approach or behavior to be taken. Two important models are the Four Framework Approach (Bolman and Deal 1991) and the Managerial Grid (Blake and Mouton 1985).

Helode (1994) employed the grid approach to study, 9 managers (4 from Govt. and 5 from private organizations) and found managers from both Govt. and private organizations have shown significantly more concern for 'task' than for 'workers'. Managers from both Govt. and private organizations did not differ significantly with respect to their concern for 'task' however, managers from Government organizations have shown significantly more concern for 'workers' than their counterparts from private organizations. In Bangladesh no work has so far been done in this aspect. Thus this study was undertaken to find out and compare the leadership styles of both BSRI and BSFIC professionals.

This study used the Blake and Mouton (1985) Leadership Grid technique. Two axes were "Concern for people" which plotted in the vertical axis and "Concern for task" which plotted along the horizontal axis. Both were measured on a scale from 1 to 9.

Concern for people	9	1/9	purpose is incidental to lack of conflict and "good fellowship"				9/9	purpose is from integration of task and human requirements		
	8									
	7									
	6									
	5		5/5 purpose comes first but morale can not be ignored.							
	4									
	3	1/1	Purpose is unsustainable, people are lazy and in conflict.				9/1	Man is a machine, leaders role is plan direct and control.		
	2									
	Low 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	High 9	
	Concern for task									

Figure 1. The Leadership Grid

Blake and Mouton (1985) leadership grid comes up with five types of leaders as follows:

- **Team Leader** (9 on task, 9 on people)
- **The middle-of-the-road style** (5 on task, 5 on people)
- **Authoritarian** (9 on task, 1 on people)
- **Country Club** (1 on task, 9 on people)
- **Impoverished** (1 on task, 1 on people).

1. The impoverished style (1,1)

In this style, managers have low concern for both people and task. Managers use this style to avoid getting into trouble. The main concern for the manager is not to be held responsible for any mistakes, which results in less innovative decisions.

2. The country club style (1,9)

This style has a high concern for people and a low concern for task. Managers using this style pay much attention to the security and comfort of the employees, in hopes that this would increase performance. The resulting atmosphere is usually friendly, but not necessarily productive.

3. The authoritarian style (9,1)

With a high concern for task, and a low concern for people, managers using this style find employee needs unimportant; they provide their employees with money and expect performance back. Managers using this style also pressure their employees through rules and punishments to achieve the company goals. This style is based on Theory X.

4. The middle-of-the-road style (5,5)

Managers using this style try to balance between company goals and workers needs. By giving some concern to both people and task, managers who use this style hope to achieve acceptable performance.

5. The team style (9,9)

In this style, high concern is paid both to people and task. As suggested by the propositions of Theory Y, managers choosing to use this style encourage teamwork and commitment among employees.

A pre-structured and pre-tested questionnaire was used to collect the data. Four important components like philosophy, planning, implementation and evaluation were considered to measure the leadership styles. Nine (9) Managing Directors (MD) of sugar mills under Bangladesh Sugar and Food Industries Corporation (BSFIC) and the Eleven (11) Division/Section Heads of Bangladesh Sugarcane Research Institute (BSRI) were selected as leader for this study. The study was conducted during the workshop held at BSRI on July 2006.

Data shows that first preference of total leadership score of both BSRI & BSFIC professional was 9/1 i.e the authoritarian style. This means that they are high concern for task and low concern for people. Leaders using this style find employee needs unimportant; they provide their employees with money and expect performance back. Managers using this style also pressure their employees through rules and punishments to achieve the company goals. Helode (1994) reported the similar findings for both government and private organizations in Indian setup. The second preference was found as 1/1, which means if they failed to implement their first preference it becomes the worst. In this situation, they skip to their third preference which was found as 1/9, means low concern for task but high concern for the people. The similar trend was found in both BSRI and BSFIC professionals individually (Table 1). As per t-test, leadership styles of BSRI and BSFIC professionals were similar.

Table 1. Total style scores of leadership (T-score)

	9/9	5/5	9/1	1/9	1/1	t	sig
BSRI	56	50	75	66	73		
						-1.423	0.228
BSFIC	63	63	76	64	74		
Total Avg	59	56	75	64	73		

Component scores of leadership style was also calculated and presented in Table 2. In case of philosophy, the professionals of both BSRI and BSFIC preferred 1/1 styles first. However, their second preference was 9/1 style. In this component, 9/9 and 5/5 styles were weaker than desirable in both organizations (Table 2). Professionals of BSRI and BSFIC did not differ significantly in this component of leadership. In case of planning, the professionals of both BSRI and BSFIC preferred 9/1 styles first. Their second preference can be any one of the 5/5, 1/9 or 1/1 styles. This is somehow better because except 9/9

all other styles were better than desirable limit (Table 3). In this component of leadership, professionals of BSRI were significantly better than that of their BSFIC counterparts.

Table 2. Philosophy component scores of leadership style (T-score)

	Philosophy						
	9/9	5/5	9/1	1/9	1/1	t	sig
BSRI	9	9	13	11	16		
						-1.50	0.208
BSFIC	11	9	14	11	16		
Total Avg	10	9	13	11	16		

Table 3. Planning component scores of leadership style (T-score)

	Planning						
	9/9	5/5	9/1	1/9	1/1	t	sig
BSRI	12	13	14	13	12		
						-3.20	0.033
BSFIC	10	11	13	12	12		
Total Avg	11	12	13	12	12		

In case of implementation, the professionals of both BSRI and BSFIC preferred equally 9/1 and 1/1 styles first. Their second preference can be any one of the 5/5 or 9/1 styles. This is also better style because except 9/9 all other styles were stronger than desirable limit (Table 4). Professionals of BSRI and BSFIC did not differ significantly in this component of leadership.

Table 4. Implementation component scores of leadership style (T-score)

	Implementation						
	9/9	5/5	9/1	1/9	1/1	t	sig
BSRI	11	13	14	13	14		
						0.784	0.477
BSFIC	12	12	14	11	14		
Total Avg	11	12	14	12	14		

In case of evaluation, the professionals of both BSRI and BSFIC equally preferred 9/9, 9/1 and 1/9 styles first. Their second preference was 5/5 style. This is somehow better because except 9/9 all other styles were better than desirable limit. Professionals of BSRI and BSFIC did not differ significantly in this component of leadership (Table 5). Thus we can conclude as, on components styles 9/9 was weaker than desirable in all four cases.

As we know 9/9 style can achieve the best performance for the organization, so it is expected that the leaders/managers of both the organizations will try to make it up their leadership styles more.

Table 5. Evaluation component scores of leadership style (T-score)

	Evaluation						
	9/9	5/5	9/1	1/9	1/1	t	sig
BSRI	12	12	12	12	12		
						1.372	0.242
BSFIC	12	11	12	12	9		
Total Avg	12	11	12	12	10		

REFERENCES

- Bass, Bernard (1989). *Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, Bernard (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18 (3):19-31.
- Blake, Robert R. and Mouton, Janse S. (1985). *The Managerial Grid III: The Key to Leadership Excellence*. Houston: Gulf Publishing Co.
- Bolman, L. and Deal, T. (1991). *Reframing Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, James M. & Posner, Barry Z. (1987). *The Leadership Challenge*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lamb, L. F.; McKee, K. B. (2004). *Applied Public Relations: Cases in Stakeholder Management*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Routledge
- U.S. Army Handbook (1973). *Military Leadership*.
- Helode RD (1994) Leadership in industrial organizations and the grid approach in Indian context. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*. 20(1): 7-16